

REMARKS

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8, 12-21, and 23 on grounds of obviousness based on US patent 5,223,827 to Bell et al. (the Bell reference) in view of US Patent 6,434,715 to Andersen (the Andersen reference), and US Patent 6,502,131 to Vaid (the Vaid reference).

2. Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 12-21, and 23 are presently pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 23.

3. Summary of the Prior Art

a. Bell

In Bell, the system looks for the occurrence of events, and then checks to see if the number of events in a given time frame exceed a threshold. If the threshold is exceeded, the system may then take an action as determined by a table that specifies events for each type of event that surpasses its threshold. The specification provides as an example of an event "Typically, this might be the generation of a message containing parameters of interest for this type of event and the transmission of the message via microprocessor 102 to network manager 106." (Bell, col. 5, lines 45-52).

b. Andersen

In Andersen, the system is attempting to identify patterns of certain event types that may give indications of an underlying problem or developing fault. Thus, Andersen receives event notices and then generates *additional* warnings called "repeat events" if the event is recurring. To qualify as a repeat event, Andersen checks to see if certain conditions have been met (such as the occurrence of a certain number of events as set forth in Figures 2A-C, and in the specification, col. 3, lines 58-59: "A limit may be set as to how many repeats should be observed before a repeat event/message is generated."). Finally, Andersen states that the number of repeat events may be limited: "Similarly a limit may be programmed in as to how many repeat events/messages should be generated regardless of the number of

observations made." That is, at some point, Anderson will stop generating repeat event warnings.

4. Response to Rejections

a. Response to Rejection of Claims 1 and 21

Applicant traverses this rejection, because the combination of the references does not contain all the claimed elements.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that it is first determined whether a received events is presently indicated to be a recurring event. If it is not, then a determination is made as to whether it should be logged as a recurring event. If the initial determination is made that it is already a recurring event, then its status is verified as still correct by confirming that a predetermined number of equivalent SNMP events have been generated in the preceding time period. Then, if so verified, the event is not presented in the event list to the user.

Applicants submit that the separate steps of determining whether the event is already in a recurring state, together with verifying that the "recurrent" status is still warranted are not shown by the references, singly or in combination. Applicants therefore request reconsideration, and allowance of claim 1 and claims dependent therefrom.

b. Response to Rejection of Claim 8

Applicants submit that Claim 8 was previously amended to clarify that the "recurring state" status is verified (by "determining whether the event condition has occurred more than a first predetermined number of times in a first preceding time period" *if* the SNMP event condition is in a recurring state) before determining whether to prevent "the received data relating to the event condition from being presented in the event list to the user." The steps of determining that the event is in a recurrent state followed by a separate verification step is not suggested by the references. Indeed, the Examiner has not provided any argument that such separate steps are present, and has merely cited to Bell's abstract and column 1, lines 15-62 as disclosing the step of determining a recurring state. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection does not set forth a full reasoned argument as to where all the claim elements reside in the prior art. Applicants believe claim 8 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by

the cited references, and respectfully request reconsideration, and allowance of claim 8 and the claims depending therefrom.

c. Response to Rejection of Claim 23

Claim 23 has been amended to clarify that the "recurring state" status is verified, and respectfully request that the claim is allowable for the same reasons as set forth above.

5. Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 312-913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: August 17, 2006

By: /Robert J. Irvine III/
Robert J. Irvine III
Registration No. 41,865